

REMARKS

Claims 1-83 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-83 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Summary of Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-83 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *The MathWorks “Simulink: Model-based and System-based Design,” Using Simulink*, Version 5, copyright 1990-2002, last printed July 2002, chapters 2 through 11, 13 and 14 (hereafter “Simulink5”) in view of Chandhoke et al., United States Published Application No. 2003/0144751 (hereafter “Chandhoke”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 1

Applicants’ claim 1 recites:

1. In a graphical modeling and execution environment, a method comprising the steps of:

providing a model view and an execution list view of a model being executed, the model view graphically depicting a plurality of components of the model, the execution list view displaying *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of the model*, the *dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*, the model view interfaced with a debugger; and

indicating visually a state of the dynamically updated execution list on the model view at the specified point in the time step.

Applicants respectfully urge that Simulink5 and Chandhoke, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination fail to disclose at least *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model* and *the dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model*

to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step, which are present in claim 1.

With regards to *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model*, in the Office Action, the Examiner claims that pages 2-10, 2-11, 2-19, 2-20, 5-16, 5-17 and page 10-40 in the Simulink5 reference disclose this feature of claim 1. See Office Action, paragraph 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The above sections cited by the Examiner discuss various elements of the SIMULINK® software. Specifically, pages 2-10 and 2-11 discuss processing that occurs at each time step. Pages 2-19 and 2-20 discuss algebraic loops. Pages 5-16 and 5-17 discuss controlling an execution order of **blocks** that occurs on the basis of execution priorities and displaying the **block** execution order. Page 10-40 discusses possible causes of slow simulations. None of the pages cited by the Examiner discuss *an execution list depicting the execution order of a plurality of methods called during a time step*. At best, in the cited pages, Simulink5 describes displaying intermediate results using a display block and displaying a **block execution order**. See Simulink5, pp. 2-10 and 5-17. However, Simulink5 provides no disclosure or suggestion that the displayed results or block execution order includes a list of **methods** called, let alone a list that depicts an execution order of **methods** called during a time step.

Chandhoke describes a system for previewing a sequence of motion control operations controlled by a user through a GUI (see Chandhoke, Abstract, Figure 5 and pages 9-11). The displayed operations are updated based on user input. However, nowhere does Chandhoke disclose *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model*. Therefore, Chandhoke fails to cure shortcomings associated with Simulink5 with regards to disclosing or suggesting *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model*, which is present in Applicants' claim 1.

Regarding the Applicants' claimed *dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*, as noted above, since neither Simulink5 nor

Chandhoke disclose *an execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during a time step*, these references fail to disclose a *dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*.

For reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Simulink5 and Chandhoke, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination fail to disclose at least *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model* and *the dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*, which are present in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-38

Claims 2-38 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-38 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-38.

Claim 39

Independent claim 39 is a medium claim that contains *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of the model* and *the dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*. As noted above, Simulink5 and Chandhoke, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least *an execution list depicting a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model*. Therefore, Simulink5 and Chandhoke fail to disclose *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of the model* and *the dynamically updated*

execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step, which is present in claim 39. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 39 be withdrawn.

Claims 40-76

Claims 40-76 depend from independent claim 39 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 39. Accordingly, claims 40-76 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 39. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 40-76.

Claim 77

Applicants' claim 77 recites:

A system in an electronic device having a graphical design environment, the system comprising:

storage for a debugger, the debugger gathering debug information from the simulation of a model in the graphical design environment; and

a display device in communication with the electronic device, the display device displaying:

a model view, the model view displaying a plurality of components of a model and being interfaced with the debugger; and

an execution list view, the execution list view displaying *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during the execution of a time step of the model, the dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list the methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*, the execution list view state being visually represented on the model view, the execution list view being generated by the debugger.

Independent claim 77 is a system claim that contains *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of the model and the dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in*

execution of the time step. As noted above, Simulink5 and Chandhoke, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least *an execution list depicting a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of a model*. Therefore, Simulink5 and Chandhoke fail to disclose *a dynamically updated execution list depicting an execution order of a plurality of methods called during an execution of a time step of the model and the dynamically updated execution list changing during the execution of the model to list methods that have been called during the time step until a specified point in execution of the time step*, which is present in claim 39. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 39 be withdrawn.

Claims 78-83

Claims 78-83 depend from independent claim 77 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 77. Accordingly, claims 78-83 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 77. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 78-83.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 227-7400.

Dated: January 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By_____/jsc/_____
John S. Curran
Registration No.: 50,445
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicants